

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 5a and 5b. Figs. 5a and 5b are amended to add the legend "(PRIOR ART)", as requested by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

In this Response, the specification and claims 1, 3, 4, 7-11 and 14-16 are amended. The specification is amended to add the section heading Federally Sponsored Research and Development, and the abstract of the disclosure is amended to meet the word-length requirement of 37 CFR 1.72(b). Please cancel claim 17, without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and remarks made herein.

I. Drawings Objections

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Respectfully, Figs. 3, 4 and 5c clearly show the claimed embodiments of the invention. For example, Fig. 5c shows steps including providing a first parallel request information in a first time slot, performing a first step in the first time slot depending on the first parallel request information to obtain a first matching information, providing a last parallel request information in a last time slot successive to the first parallel time slot, performing a last step in the last time slot depending on the last parallel request information and depending on the first matching information to obtain a final matching information, and assigning the pending data packets at the number of inputs to the number of outputs based on the final matching information. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 1, 16 and 17 have been objected to, for the reason set forth on pages 4-5 of the Office Action. In this Response, claim 17 has been canceled, and claims 1 and 16 are amended to replace the phrase "successive the first time slot" with successive to the first time slot.

Withdrawal of the instant claim objections is respectfully requested.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, for the reasons set forth on page 5 of the Office Action. As noted above, claim 17 has been canceled.

Amended claim 16 is believed to be directed to statutory subject matter, as the claim is directed to a "program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform ..."

As stated in MPEP § 2106.1, "a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory."

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0231588 attributed to *Roth et al.* (hereinafter "*Roth*"), for the reasons set forth on pages 6-8 of the Office Action.

With regard to claims 1 and 16, Applicants respectfully submit that *Roth* does not teach "providing a first parallel request information in a first time slot, the first parallel request information indicating data packets at the inputs requesting transmission to the outputs of the switching system" and "performing a first step in the first time slot depending on the first parallel request information to obtain a first matching information".

Roth (Fig. 1) shows that each input node 12 contains unicast queue trackers 16, multicast queue trackers 17 and weight generators 20. *Roth* (paragraph [0033]) discloses: "for each queue in the set of available input nodes generating a weight value reflecting the urgency of the specified queue to transmit its queued cells". *Roth* (paragraph [0037]) discloses that "if the highest weight queue is a multicast queue, sending a request containing the weight of the queue to one or more output nodes relating to the multicast queue".

Applicants believe that *generating a weight value reflecting the urgency of the specified queue to transmit its queued cells, and sending a request containing the weight of the queue to one or more output nodes*, as taught by *Roth*, is not analogous to "providing a first parallel request information in a first time slot, the first parallel request information indicating data packets at the inputs requesting transmission to the outputs of the switching system", as claimed in claims 1 and 16. Consider that *Roth* does not teach providing a first parallel request information in a first time slot, as claimed. For example, at most *Roth* discloses defining an initial set of available input nodes (see Fig. 3).

Roth (paragraphs [0038]-[0040]) discloses: "in respect of each output node receiving requests from one or more input nodes: determining a highest weight input node being the input node having the highest weight queue of those input nodes from which a request was received; sending a grant to the highest weight input node".

That is, *Roth* teaches that each output node compares the weights of the different requests and determines the input node having the highest weight of those input nodes from which it received a request, and that the highest weight input node receives a grant.

Roth fails to teach how input nodes receive information, much less how a match or grant could be determined in a first time slot.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, *Roth* does not anticipate claims 1 and 16. Applicants respectfully submit that inasmuch as claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1, and claim 1 is patentable over *Roth*, claims 2-8 are patentable as dependent on a patentable independent claim. Withdrawal of the instant rejections is respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that *Roth* does not teach "a first allocation stage for performing a first step of the matching method in a first time slot depending on a first parallel request information provided in the first time slot to obtain a first matching information". Analogous arguments to those made above in connection with the rejections of claims 1 and 16 apply.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, *Roth* does not anticipate claim 9. Applicants respectfully submit that inasmuch as claims 10-15 are dependent on claim 9,

and claim 9 is patentable over *Roth*, claims 10-15 are patentable as dependent on a patentable independent claim.


Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 21, 2007



William J. Hoofe IV
Reg. No. 54,183
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Tel: (516)-692-8888
Fax: (516)-692-8889